



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

and equitable treatment of all races—a policy that will grant the rights of citizenship regardless of race or nationality, and to provide that all aliens should be under the special protection of the national government.

XII. The combined influence of the women of all countries is one of the most effective forces in opposition to war. We recognize that this influence cannot be fully exerted except through the adequate recognition of their social and political rights.

XIII. This Congress believes that universities and col-

leges should undertake especial research and instruction in international relations, and the sanitation of international politics and diplomacy by the application of science to the higher relations of men.

XIV. This Congress deplores every attempt to militarize this country. It declares against the establishment of military training in the schools, on the ground that this is reactionary and inconsistent with American ideals and standards, and leads toward the greatest burden yet borne by a civilized nation—that of military conscription—a condition incompatible with liberty.

## THE LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE

By FRANCIS B. LOOMIS

**T**HROUGHOUT five thousand years of recorded history peace, here and there established, has been kept and its area has been widened in one way only. Individuals have combined their efforts to suppress violence in the local community. Communities have co-operated to maintain the authoritative state and to preserve peace within its borders. States have formed leagues or confederations, or have otherwise co-operated, to establish peace among themselves. Always peace has been made and kept, when made and kept at all, by the superior power of superior numbers acting in unity for the common good.

"Mindful of this teaching of experience, we believe and solemnly urge that the time has come to devise and to create a working union of sovereign nations to establish peace among themselves and to guarantee it by all known and available sanctions at their command."

This statement comprises the appeal and the purpose of the League to Enforce Peace, which was organized amid the hallowed memories which surround Independence Hall in Philadelphia, on the 17th day of June last, by upwards of three hundred earnest, patriotic men. The inspiration which guided them was as noble as the inspiration which moved our forefathers to draft and sign the Declaration of Independence; and the purpose which they have in view is as pregnant with promise for beneficent effects upon mankind as was the purpose which animated the men who gave to the world the immortal declaration respecting human rights on July 4, 1776. The makers of the Declaration of Independence had in mind the creation of a nation from a number of widely-separated colonies. The men who formed the League to Enforce Peace have in mind, as an ultimate achievement, a federation of the great powers of the world for the purpose of maintaining peace. The League to Enforce Peace represents something more solid and practical than a mere expression of sentiment concerning the desirability of peace and the wastefulness and the horror of war. The men who conceived and organized it, after months of earnest consultation and striving, brought forth a plan not to put an end to war, but to diminish the possibilities of war and to reduce the number of wars. It is not a perfect plan, and it will be subject to processes of growth, amendment, and amplification; but it appeals to many men who have had hard, practical experience in governmental affairs and in deal-

ing with international questions, and who know something of the point of view of other nations and other peoples. It is a plan the simplicity and singleness of purpose of which marks it as worthy of consideration.

The aim and purpose of the league is concisely set forth in its platform, as follows:

First. All justiciable questions arising between the signatory powers not settled by negotiation shall, subject to the limitations of treaties, be submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment, both upon the merits and upon any issue as to its jurisdiction of the question.

Second. All other questions arising between the signatories, and not settled by negotiation, shall be submitted to a Council of Conciliation for hearing, consideration, and recommendation.

Third. The signatory powers shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces against any one of their number that goes to war or commits acts of hostility against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be submitted as provided in the foregoing.

Fourth. Conferences between the signatory powers shall be held from time to time to formulate and codify rules of international law, which, unless some signatory shall signify its dissent within a stated period, shall thereafter govern in the decisions of the judicial tribunal mentioned in article 1.

The strength of the league, for the present at least, is that it does not ask or seek too much. Its hopes and desires are expressed in four brief paragraphs. Two of them are familiar to every one who of recent years has given thought to international matters and to the efforts made in behalf of international conciliation by various peace and arbitration societies. The ill-timed Taft general arbitration treaties, which were hopelessly mutilated by the Senate, and the Bryan arbitration treaties both contain provisions which seek to require nations which have serious matters in dispute to agree to submit them for a year's consideration to a commission of inquiry. So the league is asking for nothing unfamiliar in this connection. All justiciable questions not settled by diplomatic negotiation it asks shall be submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment. This means arbitration; and with arbitral proceedings, their merits and defects, we are abundantly familiar. We have learned by experience that to the present time there are

certain cases which nations have not been willing to submit to arbitration. Issues which involve the integrity of national territory, national honor, the rights and protection of citizens, national prestige, we have not been able to settle by arbitration. Questions relating to remote boundaries, to pecuniary claims and disputed fishing rights, are examples of questions which may be settled where there is good will on both sides by arbitration. Whether we should open our gates to unrestricted Oriental immigration is a question which we would not be willing to submit to arbitration. If China should become a powerfully united, highly energized and purposeful military nation, and should insist that her coolies be permitted in unnumbered thousands free and unrestricted entrance to our territories, we, as members of the League to Enforce Peace, would have to invoke the second section of the platform, and submit the question to a council of conciliation for a hearing and recommendation. A year should elapse before acts of war can take place, and meanwhile perhaps the good sense of our people and the wisdom of the Chinese would find a way to adjustment which would avoid the necessity of warfare.

The part of the program of the League to Enforce Peace which is new and significant, in a way, is set forth in the third plank of the platform. The signatory powers "shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces against any one other member that goes to war or commits acts of hostility against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be submitted," as provided, to a tribunal. If it is a justiciable question, it shall be submitted to a judicial tribunal. If it is a question which cannot be determined by such a tribunal—a question affecting the very life of a nation—it must be submitted to a council of conciliation. A sovereign state, which is a member of the league, which fails to comply with the requirements of the first and second paragraphs of the platform, and which resorts to war without submitting its cause to a council of conciliation, and without awaiting the decision and recommendation of that body, automatically becomes an outlaw, an offender against organized international society, a breaker of treaties, a government lacking in honesty, decency, and good faith. Automatically, under the plan proposed the combined economic and military forces of the remaining members of the league are mobilized and directed against the erring and recalcitrant member of the alliance.

This part of the league's program seems to call for further consideration and very considerable amendment. It does not seem either wise or practicable that war should "forthwith be declared against the power which had begun hostilities" without requiring the submission of its cause to the judgment of an impartial tribunal. An examination of the history of wars during the past six hundred years will show, I think, that the supposition evidently in the minds of those who formulated this part of the platform to the effect that the responsibility of beginning a war is always an obvious and incontestable fact is really destitute of substantial foundation. The study of the beginnings of wars will show not only that the circumstances relating to the initial hostilities are often obscure, but also that the first assumption or belief as to the responsibility of the conflict has afterwards been, in many instances, very generally discredited. There ought to be provision for a thorough in-

vestigation of the question of responsibility before declaring war against the supposed recalcitrant.

It is also difficult at this time to conceive of the world as uniting against some one world power which some other power charges with violation of international law. Assuming that some such charge has been made, nations might differ as to whether it was well founded. Of course, those now imagining the possibility of unanimous action against an alleged law-breaker or treaty-breaker have in mind the case of Belgium. But even this case fails to sustain their supposition. Not long after the present war broke out, Germany and Austria were joined by Turkey. They have lately also been joined by Bulgaria. Rumors are afloat that Sweden is thinking of departing from her attitude of neutrality. The Swedish government flatly denies this; but in case Sweden should for any reason be led to abandon her position of neutrality, is it conceivable that she would be found to be fighting side by side with Russia? No doubt there are many in Sweden who cherish the thought that, if Germany and her allies should be victorious, the Finns might be emancipated from the Russian yoke and placed under Swedish rule.

The purpose of the League to Enforce Peace, as I understand it, is not offensive. It is a league of protection—of mutual protection—against, not an outside foe, but against itself. The signatory powers make an agreement to do certain things, the fundamental aim of their organization being to preserve and maintain peace. The members of the alliance, like the States of this Union, will have in some way to provide for a central police or military power or some other method or instrumentality to provide for the application, when necessary, of coercive measures. There will have to be at least a skeleton military and executive organization. This will be a difficult problem to work out; but it is not at all insoluble. And the fact that it is difficult is no valid argument against it. Nor is the likelihood that the Constitution of the United States would have to be amended to permit this country to become a member of an international alliance an insuperable objection. The Constitution has been amended a good many times, and, I dare say, that participation in a league to maintain world peace, if it promises satisfactory results, would be an issue which would appeal to the good sense and conscience of our people to such an extent that they would be very willing to vote in favor of the proposed Constitution amendments to make it legal and possible for the United States Government to enter into some world federation which has among its basic principles the salient suggestion of the League to Enforce Peace.

It is maintained by some persons that the idea of an international military or police force is not a workable plan. I reply that the objection represents nothing more than an opinion and an assertion on the part of persons who make it. The Constitution of the United States was not considered a workable plan by thousands of intelligent and honest persons. The general idea of an international federation is an old one, and the fact that it sticks so persistently in the minds of people, and continues to inform their hopes and ambitions, leads me to believe that in the end, perhaps not very far in the future, it will be translated into a workable formula.

The platform of the League to Enforce Peace is a mere skeleton suggestion. If such a league were com-

posed of the United States, Germany, Great Britain, France, Russia, Austria, Italy, and Japan, it is probable that no one of these governments would lightly or rashly attack another member of the league. In the first place, the formation of any kind of an international league looking to world peace presupposes a vast advance in educated public sentiment. No one of the countries which I have mentioned would want to become an offender. The risk would be too great, and, in view of the public sentiment, the punishment too certain and too severe. No one nor two of the nations in such a league could hope to stand out for any great length of time against the military and economic pressure which all the others could put upon it. The offender would have, in theory at least, the whole of the civilized world banded against him, because the smaller nations would, of course, become members or allies of the league. They could not do otherwise. Leaving aside the military activities, the economic pressure that a league of the great powers of the world could put upon an offending member would be crushing, and would in the course of time be as compelling and effective as war. The power of such a league for the disciplining of unruly countries such as Mexico, Turkey, and Haiti, would be unquestioned and final, and it is inevitable that once an international alliance is formed upon some such lines as those indicated in the platform of the league, there would emerge by logical evolution a highly developed, strongly centralized federal world power or government—a government which would not destroy existing nationalities; which would not of necessity crush the admirable sentiment of patriotism; which would not of necessity sterilize racial idiosyncrasies or rob peoples of their individualities and national aspirations; which would not check national development in social, intellectual, and artistic ways, but which would only result in each government surrendering certain of its attributes for the benefit of the common good to a central or federal power. The States of this Union, the people of the respective commonwealths, have lost nothing that makes life worth living, nothing that adds to human happiness, nothing that makes for the independence of the citizen, nothing that makes for liberty, for the rights of man, by delegating certain of their sovereign powers to the National Federal Government. We are perfectly willing to have the Government at Washington coin our money, make our treaties, defend our coasts, control interstate transportation and navigation, and do a hundred things which a central government can do with advantage and propriety, and do better than the State governments would themselves do. So will it be, we trust, with the international confederation which shall grow out of the strife, pain, death, and disaster of the war. We believe that the main good arising from the war will be found in a mellowing and chastening effect upon human character, which will result in the growth of greater understanding, greater toleration, and the spread of the feeling that humanity is the same the world over, that it has the same hopes, the same fears, the same aspirations, and that it ought to be entitled to the same social organization, the same rights of expressions, the same protection against itself, and that the arrogant, self-seeking nation which strives to impose its will arbitrarily upon other nations has no more place in the modern scheme of society than has the desperado, the

outlaw or the assassin who seeks unlawfully to impose his will upon peaceful citizens.

As I suggested, there will be many objections to this plan. Many good people, many earnest people, will think that the League to Enforce Peace ought not to desire to secure peace by a resort to war. But you may as well say that a policeman shall not use his club to defend himself or to prevent an innocent citizen from being assassinated. As President Lowell sagaciously remarked in the heat of the debate which this proposition evoked: "The question before us is, Shall we run the risk of war to prevent war, or shall we say, 'Let war go on, and we will wash our hands of it, for we will never touch the carnal weapon?' This," said he, "is precisely the point that arises before us. The only thing which we are here to consider is not the ideal of peace. There are plenty of societies for that, and we all agree about it. We are here because we think we have the means which will diminish warfare, which will discourage war, and our way to discourage war is the threat of the use of force."

The formulated conscientiously determined opinion of this league is that the great countries of the world ought to combine by the threat of war to prevent useless warfare. "We are not peace-at-any-price men," said Ex-President Taft, who is president of this league, "because we do not think we have reached the time when a plan which has for its basis the complete abolition of war is at all practicable. As long as nations reflect and partake of the weaknesses, ambitions, jealousies, hatreds, and other frailties of men who compose them, war is a possibility, and a very imminent possibility, which may not be ignored by any league or confederation of peace that hopes to justify its existence by the achievement of useful results."

I respect the earnestness, the endeavor, and the courage of so-called peace-at-any-price men, but I differ with them as to the means best fitted to meet present conditions and emergencies; I believe they are doing a valuable educational work, and I trust that they will continue to focus the attention of mankind upon the problems of peace. It seems to me it would be in part, at least, their function to arouse and permanently to maintain public sentiment in favor of peace so strong and militant that governments will have to take account of it; so widespread and vital that it will furnish the foundation upon which shall be built the strong international alliance of which we all dream for the effective preservation of the peace of the world. We cannot expect too much of human nature; we cannot make the mass of humanity keep pace with the ideals of the inspired enthusiast. We must take men as they are and nations as we find them, and try, through slow-going and painstaking effort, to lead them by degrees upward and forward toward the goal of our humane and kindly Christian ambition.

As I have indicated, there are a number of objections which can be made to the plan of the League to Enforce Peace. The same may be said of any other plan looking to the same general end and which designs to achieve kindred results. We are not deeply concerned with objections. I am only concerned with an interesting and salient suggestion which I believe worthy of the consideration of the people of this country, of the Government of this country, and of the people and government of all

other civilized countries, to the end that it may possibly be embraced some time in the distant future among other principles in a platform, or charter, or constitution for an international alliance of some kind which shall have for its end the maintenance of peace. It is folly to be talking at this time about definite organizations and constitutions for an international federation.

The League to Enforce Peace has expressed with brevity a few tentative principles, as it were. It has done nothing more. It has not offered definite plans for giving effect to these principles. It has prepared no elaborate scheme for an international alliance which it proposes to submit to the nations of Europe. Some of its critics have talked as though this had been done. The league has not told the nations of the world what they should do or what they should not do. It has merely invited consideration in due time of an interesting and important suggestion. It does not submit a constitution and code of laws, and ask the great governments of the world to step up and subscribe to them.

The league voices the opinion that the possibility of war may be a good deal restricted, and eras of peace a good deal prolonged, if the strong nations will form an alliance to keep the peace among themselves and agree upon some method of applying coercive measures to a sovereign state which breaks faith.

I believe that this war will carry a salutary lesson of enlightenment to mankind; that the vastness and the horror of it will sink deep into the spirits of all men, and that throughout the civilized world there will slowly grow in the minds and the hearts of the people a sentiment of hostility to war which will, within the course of a generation, become so strong that it will find expression in the formation of international alliances, with such sanction of public feeling and moral sentiment that great wars for a considerable period will be practically unthinkable. It is to profit by the emergence, from the welter of war, of such humane and hopeful sentiments as these, that the League to Enforce Peace is formed.

## PREPAREDNESS\*

By H. LA FONTAINE

THIS new word is now familiar enough among us to authorize its use not only by militarists, but more justifiably perhaps by pacifists. It seems more judicious to prepare for peace in time of war than to prepare for war in time of peace, certainly so when a war in progress is exhausting belligerents to an unprecedented extent and prohibiting them for a long time from all warlike enterprises.

What should preparedness mean to pacifists? Is it peace at any price? Is it a peace of weariness, disgust, and distress? Is it a return to an unsteady *status quo ante*? Cursed be those who would dream such dreams! They would be the abettors of more horrid and relentless wars.

Preparedness for pacifists is to ascertain the principles to be advocated by all those eager for a lasting peace and to secure the agencies intended to vindicate and apply those principles. Preparedness for pacifists is to organize the intervention of the supporters of a lasting peace forthwith, and to stand ready when, for the struggling peoples, the hour strikes again of reason and justice.

The principles to be proclaimed can be summarized as follows:

The mission of the States is not only to promote the well-being of their own citizens, but to further also the common welfare of humanity.

The sovereignty and independence of States are to be placed under their collective safeguard.

Peoples have the inalienable and inprescriptible right to dispose freely of themselves.

The exploitation of the globe is managed by the States in the collective interest of men.

The seas and all waterways are without exception open to free navigation by all peoples.

The territories of all colonies shall be open without differential treatment to the commerce of all nations.

Customs duties can have only a fiscal and transitory character and free trade should be the rule of commercial intercourse.

The relations between the States are controlled by the same principles of right, equity, and morals as those which control relations between individuals.

The conventions freely concluded between States are binding upon them as long as they are in force.

Secret treaties are void; treaties are valid only if negotiated with full knowledge and public assent of the direct representatives of the people.

All conflicts between States shall be settled in an amiable or contentious manner.

Recourse to force is limited to self-defense or judicial sanction and coercion, with the consent and co-operation of all States and only after exhaustion of all moral, political, and economic means of constraint.

Foreigners ought to enjoy in all States the liberties and rights guaranteed to nationals.

The agencies are actually in existence, but undeveloped and unorganized. They can easily be transformed and improved; the Peace Conference perpetuated as a Conference of States; the Permanent Court of Arbitration, an International Court of Justice, and an International Council of Conciliation combined as an International Judicature; the numerous official bureaus and offices co-ordinated as the parts of an International Administration.

More important and urgent, however, is to call into action the concerted efforts of the peace-making forces. The neutral states ought to move at once and be ready to act; parliamentarians, women, priests, scientists, jurists, workingmen, business men, students, should unite all over the world; their delegates should come in close touch in order to prepare for mobilization and agree upon tactics and strategy. When the diplomats meet after the war they must not be allowed to deliberate in silence and remoteness; an organized army for peace ought to stand by and watch, demand, and command.

\*The author's abstract of his address delivered at the International Peace Congress, San Francisco, October, 1915.